UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

Announcement Extraordinary!

The Autobiography of

Mahatma Gandhi

entitled

"The Story of My Experiments with Truth"

will appear exclusively from week to week

In This Magazine

Beginning April 5 Next

(The Autobiography has been copyrighted, with all rights reserved for publication in this country)

Special Six-Months' Subscription, beginning in April, at $1.00

SEND NOW

Volume XCVI Number 21

Chicago, February 8, 1926

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES : *Editors* : FRANCIS NEILSON

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
George Saranton
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Gilbert Reid
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lucidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name.....

Address.....

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.
Gentlemen:
Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss).....

Address.....

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 323
Jottings—J. H. H. 326
Editorial Correspondence: American Notes—REV. SYDNEY STRONG 326

ARTICLES—
Announcement—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 323
Bulgaria's Tragedy—R. H. MARKHAM 328
Last Thoughts of Anatole France—FRANK W. GARRISON 330
Gandhi—*Tarina P. Sinha* 332

POETRY—
Moments—LUCIA TRENT 333

THE STUDY TABLE—
A Book for Boys—FREDERICK STARR 334
Van Loon on Tolerance—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 334

CORRESPONDENCE—
The Washington Conference — DAVID STARR JORDAN 334
Ambassador Page and President Wilson—EDWIN D. MEAD 334

THE FIELD—
Conference on Our Relations with Latin America 335
Churches Much Encouraged by Progress Toward World Peace During Past Year 335

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCVI MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1926 NUMBER 21

Announcement

Mahatma Gandhi is writing the story of his life!

This autobiography is now appearing serially in Young India, under the fascinating title, "The Story of My Experiments with Truth."

The moment I discovered this fact I sent a cable message to Gandhi asking if I might print his "story" in Unity. In less than twenty-four hours I received his cabled reply giving me the permission I sought. Copyright proceedings were immediately started in Washington, with all rights reserved to Unity for publication in this country. Gandhi's autobiography now belongs to this paper, and will appear exclusively in these columns.

Publication will begin in the first issue in April, dated April 5th, and will continue regularly thereafter each week until the work is completed.

Gandhi's own story of his life has long been sought. At the instance of some of his nearest co-workers, he agreed "four or five years ago to write (his) autobiography and also made a start." But events in India intruded, and the story has only now at last been written. "It is not my purpose," says Gandhi, in his Introduction, "to attempt a real autobiography. I simply want to tell the story of my numerous experiments with truth, and as my life is nothing but those experiments it is true that the story will take the shape of an autobiography. But I will not mind it, if every page of it speaks only of my experiments.....(those) experiments on the spiritual field which are known only to myself and from which I have derived such powers as I have to work on the political field."

The autobiography thus announced, and as revealed in the first few chapters now in hand, promises to be an immortal work. It will speedily take its place among the great personal documents of all time—with Augustine's "Confessions," Fox's "Journals," Newman's "Apologia Pro Vita Sua," Tolstoy's "My Confession."

In receiving permission from Gandhi himself to publish this work in this country, Unity has not only accepted a great honor, but assumed a great responsibility. It is now our business to reach the largest possible public with the treasure committed to our care. Editors, publishers, subscribers, friends, must unite in the work of spreading the news and securing readers. I call upon all who reverence Mahatma Gandhi as the greatest leader and noblest man of our time, the prophet and saint who reveals the secret of life to this distracted age, to cooperate with Unity in spreading abroad his message to mankind.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The application of the cloture in the Senate on the World Court issue constituted a perfect demonstration of the fact that the debate, with its ruthless exposure of the Court's pitiable weakness as a factor for peace, was every day arousing public opinion against the entrance of the United States. Discussion, in other words, was doing exactly what it did in the case of the League—swinging the people away from indifferent acquiescence to militant opposition. After only three weeks of debate, the proponents of the Court discovered that talk must be silenced if the cause was not to be hopelessly lost. So they clamped on the fetters, and therewith stopped a movement which would surely have engulfed them in the end. It is an ignoble close to a sorry piece of business. We only hope that the debate, curtailed as it was, went far enough to convince the public that nothing decisive or even important has been accomplished. We have made a pretty gesture, conceded a gracious bit of sentiment, but are not a millionth part of an inch nearer the goal of peace than we were before.

The Senate is the "goat" of the Calvin Coolidge regime! Since the President is the greatest man ever and thus immune to criticism—he, and his cabinet officers, and his appointees, and his man-servant, and his maid-servant, and his ox, and his ass, and anything that is Coolidge's—it follows that our newspaper scribes must find a target elsewhere, and they have chosen the U. S. Senate. If this chamber takes as much as three weeks to consider an omnibus taxation bill affecting every citizen in the country, it is obstructing the nation's business. If the senators choose to debate a few days or even a few hours on the World Court or the debt settlements or any other matter of large public moment, they are just so many windbags indulging their own foolish sense of personal dignity and importance. Nothing is too harsh, too slanderous, to say about the Senate. If a Communist said half the things about the President or the Supreme Court or any other branch of the government that are being said every day by the newspapers about the Senate, he would be landed in jail at the flick of a lamb's tail. And yet, what is the truth about the Senate? That it is perfect, that all its members are statesmen, that all its speeches and procedures are wise? Not at all! The Senate suffers from most of the weaknesses and failings of any gathering of human beings. But it still remains true that this body, with all its faults, is just about the last bulwark of liberty that is left in this republic. For years, now, we have been watching legislation bearing on civil rights. Always, as one vicious proposal after another rears its ugly head,

we find the same situation—namely, nothing can be done in the House, but we can kill it in the Senate! What is true of civil rights is true of nearly every other question vital to the welfare and perpetuity of our democracy. The House will pass anything under the party lash, the President will sign anything that the "invisible government" desires, but the Senate will ponder, debate, investigate, and in the majority of cases defeat the bad bill. For such security as this, we are willing to pay a heavy price, including some dilatoriness and an occasional good bill lost. Leave the Senate alone! It's the one good thing left in Washington.

A specific illustration of the protection which the rules and practises of the Senate provide against hasty, ill-considered, unjust and un-American legislation is that of the proposed bill for the registration of aliens. The chief sponsor of this particular iniquity is a hard-boiled ignoramus from Washington, named Johnson, who seldom sees an alien and therefore fears the same as a kind of plague. This honorable statesman would have the government register aliens exactly the way our police departments register criminals. He does not advocate an alien's gallery, after the pattern of the famous rogue's gallery, neither does he urge the taking of finger prints, if we remember rightly. But everything else from signing names and having pictures taken to carrying certificates of identification and reporting all deaths, marriages, sickness and imprisonment is carefully provided for. The whole scheme is in essence, of course, an intolerable nuisance, first to the alien and secondly to the government itself. But more important than either, however great, is injustice. The whole aim and purpose of this registration idea is to put the alien under suspicion, to make the government a constant spy upon the personal habits and daily doings of millions of inoffensive persons who ask only to be understood and helped to become good citizens. The net result would be the creation of a vast semi-criminal class, with the government transformed into a great secret police to watch and harry them. The proposal overthrows the whole tradition of America as a land of refuge for the forlorn and oppressed among the peoples of the earth. Legislation of this abominable character should not, of course, be even considered, much less enacted into law. Yet it is practically certain that some kind of registration bill will pass the House, and it is absolutely certain that such bill, if it ever reached the desk of the President, would be signed within an hour. Only the Senate stands in the way. The situation, bad as it is, is not alarming, because anything the House passes will in all probability die in the Senate. And this is precisely the reason why the outcry against the Senate is so loud and bitter! It is the 100 per centers, who want America in the hands of another Mussolini, who hate and would destroy this body.

The proceedings of the State Department in Washington continue to be an unending source of amusement and disgust. After having excluded the Countess Karolyi, for example, from these shores, the Department has now allowed Lady Moseley, the daughter of the late Lord Curzon, to land and travel here. The Englishwoman seems to be as beautiful and charming as her Hungarian rival, and considerably more radical. Thus she boasts loudly of her Socialism, declares that everybody in England with any brains is a member of the Labor Party, speaks in commendation of various Communistic ideas and policies, and in general does her utmost to spread notions subversive of the political philosophy of Coolidge, Kellogg & Co., and therefore of the solid substantiality of the republic. Yet, this dangerous "red" is not only allowed to enter the country, but to journey about and talk loudly, without any interference of any kind. What is the reason for this discrimination between the English lady and the Hungarian countess? It cannot be possible that the State Department is ignorant of Lady Moseley and her political proclivities, for surely the honorable Secretary knows all things, and is infallible as well as omniscient. How otherwise could the safety of the nation have been committed to his tender and solicitous care? But if the Secretary knows the facts, why does he not proceed against the English intruder? Why were her passports not refused at the start? Are there any differences in the two cases which can explain? Yes, there *are* differences! Lord Curzon's daughter moves in the best society in Britain; Countess Karolyi is an exile. Lady Moseley is rich; the Countess is poor. The English woman has friends at court, is near to the very throne itself; the Hungarian is as friendless as she is homeless. The English ambassador at Washington is a gentleman who gladly serves a distinguished countrywoman; the Hungarian ambassador is a cad who secretly slanders a countrywoman for his own profit and his nation's glory. The differences in the two cases are obvious, and the discrimination perhaps inevitable. Mr. Kellogg is at least consistent—he is still the silly puppet who capers as fortune pulls the strings.

It must be a blessed relief to the British Labor Party that Lloyd-George has decided in his wisdom not to take over the leadership of that organization. There have been dire rumors of late that, having exhausted the possibilities of both the Liberal and the Tory Parties, the versatile ex-Premier would place his talents at the disposal of the Labor Party and ask in return for such a priceless gift only the trifling privilege of taking Mr. MacDonald's place

and showing him and his associates how to run things. It has seemed impossible that the Labor Party could even consider a bargain of this kind; but the Party had never had the experience of rival organizations of actually taking Mr. George as a steady diet and getting deathly sick in the process, and thus might conceivably be tempted by a tit-bit so attractive outwardly, if so tainted inwardly. But Lloyd-George has now himself taken the initiative in scorning association with the Laborites, and casting in his lot, until something better shows up at least, with the Liberals. This is terrible news for the Liberals, who have been living in hope that they might get rid of their plugged nickel by passing it off on the innocent radicals. But no such luck! Lloyd-George is going to stick—which means, of course, the final doom of the Liberal Party, whose one hope was good riddance of the wily Welshman. What is loss to the Liberals, however, is all clear gain to the Laborites. At bottom it has been our conviction all along that the latter know Lloyd-George and their own souls well enough to know that the two can no more mix successfully than a typhoid-fever germ can mix with a drop of pure blood. We have had too great a regard for the Labor Party and its leaders to believe for a single moment that they could sell themselves and the future of the Empire for such a mess of pottage as the Welsh leader was concocting. But all the time, none the less, there lurked the horrible suspicion in our mind that Lloyd-George was diabolically fascinating, the Labor Party unquestionably human, politics always a dangerous game, and that the combination might work a catastrophe. But now Lloyd-George himself has ended it. He has done one service at least to his country.

Since the death of Cardinal Mercier, all the world has been telling afresh the story of his heroism during the Great War. There can be no doubt of this heroism. Mercier was one of the few wholly sublime and beautiful figures which arose out of the horrors of that vast conflict. His denunciation of his country's invaders, his exhortations to his people to stand fast in defense of their own, his contemptuous refusal to be silent in the face of the enemy, his final mastery of Von Bissing by the sheer power of the spirit over the sword, all were in the best epic tradition. But it is not of this that we would speak particularly at this time. We would emphasize not so much the heroism of the man, which has been amply eulogized, as the august genius and nobility of the churchman. Mercier believed profoundly in the primacy of religion among all mundane affairs. In an age of unprecedented terror and confusion, when violence usurped the throne of power, he calmly declined to abdicate his spiritual seat. Mercier held that in the hour of war, as in the hour of peace, his duty as God's shepherd was to guard his flock, heal their hurts and injuries, and vindicate their rights. Never for one single moment did he yield his position of spiritual authority to the capricious dictatorship of the German invader. Threats didn't daunt him, imprisonment didn't deter him. Faced by the prospect of cruel death, he went calmly about his duties, preaching his word without compromise or evasion, doing his work in full obedience to his conscience and his God. Not since the Middle Ages has the world seen such a magnificent vindication of the place and power of religion. Almost alone among the spiritual leaders of the world did Mercier sustain the independency of the priest from the control either of the statesman or the soldier. This was a matchless service, for which worshippers of every faith should bow in reverence before the great Cardinal's tomb. Mercier will be remembered always as a peerless patriot; in due time and order, he will be sainted. But we like best to think of him as a churchman standing undaunted among his ruined altars in service of his only ruler, God.

The one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the independence of this nation is being celebrated by the Thomas Paine National Historical Association (50 West 47th Street, New York City) by the publication of a handsome new edition of the works of Thomas Paine. This edition, appropriately called the "Patriots' Edition," is in ten volumes, and is complete. It includes a new life of Paine in one volume, which presents hitherto unpublished material not known even to Moncure D. Conway when he wrote his great two-volume biography. Of Thomas Paine it may be said that he was the greatest man ever maligned by an ignorant and deceived posterity. He was essentially the lover of liberty, and hence the foe of every institution, in church and state alike, which visited tyranny upon mankind. His services in this country, during the period of the Revolutionary War, were indispensable to the cause of independence. What Washington did with his sword, and Patrick Henry and Samuel Adams with their voices, Paine did with his eloquent and valorous pen. His "Common Sense" is one of the immortal revolutionary documents of all time. When America was free, Thomas Paine returned to England, where his "The Rights of Man" did for Englishmen, in their great fight for the larger liberties which came in 1832, what his writings had already done across the seas. With the outbreak of revolution in France, Paine went to Paris, where he was at first acclaimed with honor as a world-famous champion of freedom, and later cast into prison and all but led to the guillotine for his oppo-

sition to the madness of atheism and new tyranny. Next to Voltaire, Thomas Paine was the greatest pamphleteer of modern times. Wherever his matchless pen could serve men struggling for emancipation, there he went. "Where liberty is not, there is my country" was his truest word and his fittest epitaph. Among the first and greatest of American patriots, he was at his best a citizen of the world.

Jottings

Current Thought, an excellent monthly magazine published by S. Ganesan in Madras, India, refers to us in its December issue in the following complimentary terms, for which we offer humble thanks:

"UNITY has made itself justly renowned for its sympathetic and penetrating study of Gandhism."

January 17-23 was "Thrift Week." February 14-20 is "National Drama Week." We suggest, as the next period of special observance, a "Just Nothing At All Week." We believe that this would be greeted by the great and general public with unprecedented acclaim.

The New York *American* is giving prizes for the best answers to the query, "New York's statues—what are they thinking about?" This reminds us of the marvellous description given by a Harvard student in our day of the familiar classical statue of the Greek dramatist, Sophocles. He called it, "Sophocles waiting for the applause of the world to die away."

The *Crisis* reports that the negroes of America have raised $71,166.16 as a fund for legal defense. This is an encouraging sign of the awakening of the Negroes to a realization of their own interests, and of what they themselves can do on behalf of these interests. What is now being done is only a beginning of what will eventually be done." We ought to raise at least a million dollars a year," says the *Crisis.* We expect to live to see precisely this thing achieved.

Luther Burbank is a great man but his declaration of infidelity was not impressive. In the case of every such utterance it is to be remembered that authority in one field by no means guarantees authority in another.

The true logic of the 100 per cent patriotic mind was revealed in the recent protest of Mrs. Granville Black, of New York, against the reading of the Ten Commandments in the public schools.

" 'Thou shalt not kill,' " she said, "should not be read, because it will bolster up pacifist propaganda. You know you must kill! I want my country to be always prepared to kill the invader."

Mrs. Black is logical, and also honest. She shows what the pacifist has always contended—that war and religion are utterly irreconcilable.

J. H. H.

American Notes

[Editorial Correspondence]

I am writing from San Francisco. This morning, I heard a rustle under the door of my bed-room and there found a little card, in pink color, saying, "Good morning. For breakfast, today, our cook has made the most delightful Hot Corn Gems." This little welcome is an intimation that American business life is emphasizing increasingly the note of cheerful service. While out for an auto ride yesterday, my friend who was giving me a view of the Golden Gate, the Cliff House and other beauty spots, drew up to a little house beside the road, tastefully painted and ornamented, one of many such houses, called "service stations." A smiling youth ran out to serve us. He looked the car all over. When asked if any oil or gasoline were needed, he smiled and said "No," and as we went away he smiled again, although we had purchased nothing.

I had a long conversation with an intelligent teacher in the public schools. He is at present at the head of a department in an up-to-date high school in a suburb of San Francisco. In answer to my inquiries, he said that the schools of America, especially in the cities, were fast becoming splendidly equipped, at least in a physical sense. I found this to be quite true, when I visited his school. I found a fine auditorium, a perfect gymnasium, a laboratory much better than the one of my college days, class-rooms with perfect lighting, play-fields for all kinds of games, even horsemanship being taught. Instead of the old fashioned stairs between floors, I found gently ascending, broad stepless ways.

I next asked him about movements of note in education. He replied that for a dozen or more years there had been a distinct effort to keep boys and girls in the High schools—the movement even being promoted by "social service" groups like the Rotarians, the Kiwanis, etc. The result is seen in the fact that never before have the High schools

been so crowded. Hundreds of these schools are equal, in attendance and culture, to colleges of the past generation. Along with this movement, the state universities have grown with tremendous speed, each state having one or more regular universities, beside one or more big agricultural schools. California, for example, has the state university at Berkeley, with a "Branch" at Los Angeles—total enrollment being around 20,000 students. The colleges however have hardly held their own. They have been unable to offer as much as the universities, which have behind them the state tax-roll. The universities also often have incomes from large land grants, which steadily mount up as values increase.

My friend called attention to a kind of counter movement that was taking place. Along with encouragement to go to high schools, there is setting in a general effort to curtail enrollment in the universities. Entrance examinations are being made stiffer. I talked with several high school pupils, who were "afraid" they "could not get into the university." This is something new in American life, for formerly every boy and girl was encouraged "to get a college education." My intelligent friend said that the movement to cut down attendance in state institutions came from three sources. The taxpaying and business interests were protesting against the expense. More and more business interests were managing government. In consequence, governors are practicing, at least preaching, economy. Along with this is a growing idea that the "state is doing too much in all the affairs of life." There is a renaissance of Individualism—sometime called "Americanism"—that asserts that the state is doing too much for the youth. This has shown itself in powerful opposition to child-labor laws. There is appearing an anti-socialism, that shows opposition even to social workers, not controlled by business. The appearance of the "community chests" is evidence of business-controlled charity. A third cause for the movement to curtail attendance in the universities is a scarcity in the land of less skilled labor, due in part to the immigration laws. The desire for cheap labor makes the presence of "hordes of college graduates" irritating to employers who are looking for laborers. The result of all this is a strong effort to cut down appropriations to universities and to raise entrance demands. Even the character of the university president is being affected; for to manage a state university now, the "president must be a clever politicion—especially in the West."

As to religion in the schools, my friend thought that there was a strong drift away from organized religion, but an equally strong drift toward a real religion that expressed itself in conduct. As to the teaching of evolution, he smiled and said the situation was not serious. In California, for example, the matter was settled in the following way. A complaint made against certain text-books in biology, used in the public schools, was referred by the state board of education to the heads of the state colleges and universities, who gave as their unanimous opinion that the text-books against which complaints were made were satisfactory. This settled it in California. The anti-evolutionary excitement—so far as the schools are concerned—is liable to pass in a few years. So thinks my friend, and I agree with him.

I also had a long talk with a clergy-friend, on his way to San Francisco—900 miles—to sit on a commission, meeting at the "School of Religion" to consider, "Recruits for the Ministry." He said, there was a distinct falling off in the quantity and the quality of candidates for the ministry. I naturally proceeded to quiz him as to the causes and the remedies. He has the right to testify, because for thirty years, in Chicago and on the Pacific Coast, he has been acting as superintendent of missions. And here he was ready to make a 36-hour journey—each way—to spend a day to consider with others a question of recruits for the ministry.

When I asked him what special appeal there was today for a young man to become a minister, he admitted that it was difficult to find a compelling appeal. There are in the first place so many calls to the young people, which seem more worth while and more attractive. Emphasis in the schools is being laid upon sports and commercial life. Clashing in the churches between "fundamentalists" and "modernists" looks to the young folks in the schools as both unseemly and unscientific. The clergymen whose voices are heard over the Radio—the most of them—do not encourage the young listeners to "go and do likewise." My friend said that young men turned away from the thought of managing a church in which there seemed to be clashing and intolerance, and that the theological seminaries, after getting hold of a young man, did not offer an appealing and efficient training.

We agreed that the situation looked bad, from the standpoint of the churches. We agreed too that the fault was not in the young people, who were as venturesome and as self-sacrificing as ever, who were ever ready to give their lives for what appealed to them as worth while; that the churches were largely to blame in not furnishing an adequate appeal, an adequate training, and what was more, in not going out and presenting that appeal to them. We agreed that the churches should quit fighting science—to which the youth of the land were fully committed; should cease quarreling on the inside, and should offer a plain, ethical, social, spiritual platform—non-theological, non-liturgical—on which the youth might be urged to stand and proclaim a real, living message. We agreed that the churches should mend their ways, should become leaders of mankind in matters worth while, should engage in actual combat against entrenched evils on earth, such as war, exploitation of weak peoples, wrongs committed against children and women, should *demonstrate the truth*, for example, of the Golden Rule,—we agreed that *then* youth would heed the call, and further, an adequate training would come forth to make them effective.

Recently I also had a long talk with a young American woman. She was coming from Moscow through Siberia, China and Japan. She had met many of the leading people in those lands. I asked her to give me her idea of the place and opportunity of America in Asia. She said that America had once been held in high esteem in Japan and China, but had lost it in Japan by her irritating discriminations, as expressed for instance in the exclusion law; and was dangerously near to losing it in China.

She would lose it if she did not clearly stand for the rights of the Chinese in determining their own national destiny. Even now, America stood second to Russia, who had outbid America for China's favor, by relinquishing extra-territorial rights, and giving up other privileges considered unjust by level-headed Chinese.

As to investments of American capital in China, especially in industries, she considered this as constituting the most serious menace to American workers, by bringing them into competition with the exceedingly low-paid workers of China. She found that Russia's influence in China was looked upon, at present, with the highest favor, and thought that Russia would have great influence in Asia, for the next 25 years, because of age-long similarity in social and industrial institutions and because Russians were going through, in village and factory life, what China would be called to go through. Her impression is that America should encourage Russian-Chinese approaches, for her own benefit; that to allow China and Siberian-Russia to enjoy freedom of exchange—the Chinese to supply Russia with the products of their cheaper industrial toil, the Russians to furnish the Chinese with the products of their cheaper agricultural toil—this, she thought would save a civilization, like America's, from too quick a shock and contact with Oriental civilization, which might amount to a world disaster.

America's position in China is being seriously questioned by the Chinese. American marines have closed up one university and used the buildings for barracks. American missionaries are being discounted as to their impartiality, so much so that some of the highest-toned missionaries are saying that it is time for them to be going home. This young American woman believes that the spiritual and economic welfare of America lies in her treatment of China, as a nation to which sovereignty should be restored and national equality accorded, that America should not allow herself to be drawn into a game of exploitation, nor into unneighborly and unjust economic penetration.

SYDNEY STRONG.

Bulgaria's Tragedy

[NOTE: This article, written us from Sofia, is one of the most important we have ever published—important for its lucid analysis of the Bulgarian problem, and for its fearless assessment of Christian responsibility for the existence of this problem. In a letter accompanying the article, the author says, "I have been a missionary in Bulgaria for many years."—Ed.]

On the afternoon of the 16th of April a group of missionaries were sitting in a room in Sofia, the capital of Bulgaria. They had gathered for their annual Mission meeting at which they were to report how many Eastern Orthodox Christians their little Mission churches had turned into Orthodox Protestants, how many pages of Protestant literature had been printed on the Mission press and how many boys and girls were attending the Mission schools. As is customary at such meetings, the presiding officer had opened the session with prayer and was explaining to the good Lord that the apparent lack of success in the Protestant work ought not to seriously disturb Him, for the Holy Spirit was really at work in many hearts and that was the important thing. The missionaries had bowed themselves into comfortable though pious postures and the somewhat soporific communication with the Deity was droning to its close when a terrific explosion was heard, the whole room shook and the prayer was momentarily interrupted. But only momentarily, for everything quieted down in an instant and the missionaries again closed their eyes, inwardly apologizing to the Lord for permitting themselves to start and peek about them just because of a noise in the street.

That noise was caused by the explosion of a bomb, which blew the roof off of a cathedral nearby and killed 140 people.

There we were, trying to turn Orthodox Christians into Congregationalists and punctiliously praying to the Lord about it, while a bunch of conspirators were murdering men, women and children in a neighboring church. A little handful of fiendish desperadoes turned more Eastern Orthodox Christians into angels in ten seconds than we missionaries could turn into Congregationalists in ten years.

And incredible as it may seem, there is a certain connection between the outrage in the church and our little prayer meeting arranged in order to induce the Lord to help us turn Eastern Orthodox Christians into Western Orthodox Christians. Not that we missionaries are in any way connected with people who do violence, for we are utterly opposed to violence and abhor the communists with all the fervor which characterizes our fellow Christians in America. Yet in a very real sense the church which we missionaries represent is responsible for what is happening in Bulgaria.

Missionaries are a sort of symbol of the insincerity and helplessness of the church. A little handful of devoted, kind-hearted missionaries over here are the "mint and cummin" to which the church devotes its attention while neglecting the weightier matters of justice and righteousness. The missionaries are a demi-tasse of fragrant, after-dinner coffee which the church is swallowing after it has devoured a whole dinner of bloody, revolting food. The coffee leaves a pleasant, pious taste in the church's mouth. The missionaries are a sonorous benediction after a strident, raucous service. They are the incense with which the church tries to smother the hideous odors of everyday transactions.

The voice of the explosion in Sofia ought to awaken all Christians from their apologetic prayers and make them see that they are never going to save the nations by sending out a few missionaries to tell the wretched victims of Christian diplomats about delightful, heavenly homes. Christian states-

men in the employ of Christian people, as well as Christian bishops and priests, are in no small degree responsible for the bomb outrages, frequent murders and intermittent civil war which makes life in Bulgaria so tragic.

Why are there conspirators in Bulgaria ready to blow up churches for a handful of gold? This is not due to any depravity, peculiarly characteristic of the Bulgarians. It is due to conditions created by Christian rulers and allowed to exist by Christian nations. In Bulgaria there is a large mass of bitter and discouraged people, some of whom have been made desperate by intolerable political and economic conditions. These conditions are not inevitable nor are they irremediable. They were created by Christian statesmen and could be changed by Christian statesmen.

The fundamental elements in the Balkan situation are very plain. First, most of the territory in the southeastern part of the Balkan Peninsula is inhabited by Bulgarians. This area is divided up into several districts which are called Bulgaria, Thrace, Macedonia and the Dobroudga. For five hundred years all of the Bulgarians in these districts were under the yoke of Turkish tyranny. In 1878 Russia drove the Turk from Europe, freed the Bulgarians and created a large independent Bulgarian state embracing all the area mentioned above. This might have been the beginning of a new era of peace and progress in the Bulkans, but England, at the Congress of Berlin, which she at once convened, revised Russia's treaty with the Ottoman Empire, brought the Turk back into Europe and cut up the newly created Bulgarian state, thrusting about half of the Bulgarians back under Turkish oppression. A comparatively small area called Bulgaria was left as an autonomous principality under Turkish suzerainty. That act of Christian England has brought untold suffering and confusion to the Balkan peoples; that was a part of England's share in the blowing up of the cathedral. Seven years later a district bounding Bulgaria on the southeast, and inhabited almost entirely by Bulgarians, declared itself independent of Turkey and asked to be annexed to Bulgaria. The Bulgarian government acquiesced and at once incorporated within the boundaries of the autonomous principality a second part of the Bulgarian nation. Russia opposed this bold act of liberation, while Austria actually incited the Serbian government to send the Serbian army into Bulgaria in an attempt to take Sofia, the capital. That was part of the share of Christian Austria and Christian Russia in the cathedral outrage. Bulgaria met the Serbian army, overwhelmingly defeated it, and before all the world confirmed the recent act of liberation. Now two-thirds of the Bulgarian nation were free and united in an autonomous principality; only a third was left in bondage to the Turks. This part, numbering about a million and a quarter Bulgarians lived in a district called Macedonia, a large, mountainous area in the south central part of the Balkan Peninsula.

From 1885 to 1912, in spite of the countless atrocities and incessant oppression, in spite of revolutions, massacres and the annihilation of whole villages, the Christians of Europe did almost nothing for the liberation of Macedonia. Of course, the Christian diplomats held occasional conferences, all of which turned out to be utterly futile.

The situation at last became intolerable and in the full of 1912 the Balkan states, Bulgaria, Serbia, Montenegro and Greece, made a united attack on Turkey with the purpose of freeing Macedonia and Thrace. They succeeded, but ambitious monarchs and unscrupulous military men drove the crusading nations into an internecine war. Bulgaria was attacked on every side and defeated, after which Macedonia was divided between the Greeks and Serbians. Once more not less than a million and a half Bulgarians were placed under foreign bondage.

The new rulers of Macedonia proved to be even more cruel than the Turks had been, and the inhabitants of the subjugated country were forced to flee into Bulgaria by the thousands. Bulgaria had not yet attained her national liberation; she still had to struggle for the freedom which the Americans claimed in 1776, which Czecho-Slovakia won in 1918 and the Irish a few years later.

The Great War offered the Bulgarians one more opportunity to fight for their complete liberation and they allied themselves to the side that offered to free Macedonia. Every other nation in the world under similar conditions would have made the same choice between the central powers and the allies which Bulgaria made, since the central powers offered the Bulgarians what Lafayette helped the Americans to achieve; while Russia and her allies offered Bulgaria very little that was certain and tangible and that little was not what Bulgaria wanted. If Bulgaria had joined the entente she would have been fighting merely for territory, like any imperialistic state. She went in with Germany in order to liberate a million people.

But she failed. She was utterly defeated, and lost Macedonia, Thrace, Dobroudga and parts of western Bulgaria. Mr. Wilson had assured the Bulgarians in one of his famous fourteen points that the Macedonian question would be settled on the basis of the principle of self-determination. That was an illusion; the one principle which lay at the base of the peace treaty, which Bulgaria had to sign, was "To the victor belongs the spoils."

The Bulgarians again failed to attain national liberation. Not less than a million and a half Bulgarians in various parts of the Balkan Peninsula were placed under the domination of hostile foreign governments. Greece at once began to drive thousands and tens of thousands of Bulgarians out of that part of Macedonia which fell to her, while Serbia began to practice terrible oppression on the hundreds of thousands of Bulgarians in her part of Macedonia. Bulgaria, already impoverished and embittered and compressed within constantly narrowing borders, was filled to overflowing with desperate and destitute refugees, who daily heard reports of atrocities committed on their relatives left in Serbia and Greece.

This was a soil in which violence and the wild spirit of revolution could not but thrive. The Bulgarian peasants and workers had borne the terrible burden of three unsuccessful wars and had returned to their homes poor, bitter and eager for revenge. They hated the military leaders who brought the wars upon them; they despised the politicians who

so often deceived them; they distrusted the Great Powers; they wanted to create a new era by quick and violent methods. They found a channel for the expression of this spiteful, tempestuous spirit in revolutionary communism, and in radical agrarianism. Many of these dissatisfied people joined the Communist party, which was inspired by Russian Bolshevism, while others flocked into the Agrarian League, which got hold of the government of the country and dismissed from all positions of power and influence those who had been responsible for the wars and the catastrophic defeats. The military men formed a conspiracy against the authority of the peasants and the growing power of the proletariat, and one night overthrew the Agrarian government. The peasants, led by the Communists, attempted a counter-revolution, which was put down with terrible cruelty, after which the Communist party was completely outlawed and the Communist representatives expelled from the National Assembly. But money flows in from Russia and desperate bands of lawless adventurers are still carrying on a murderous struggle with the merciless agents of the militaristic party.

There is no country in the world placed in so tragic a situation as Bulgaria. Here there are 500,000 refugees. There are 100,000 who have no land, no decent dwellings, no regular work, no assured income. They have been driven from the homes and land which their fathers owned through a long succession of generations, they have been deprived of place and position, of hopes and opportunities, and left as debris on the vicious sea of international hatred. For years the powers, big and little, have abused them. For decades they have been subjected to violence. Now they are blind tools in the hands of the revolutionary "lefts" or of the militaristic "rights."

And this has come about under the eyes of the Christian world, at the hands of Christian statesmen in the employ of Christian nations. And if the situation is not remedied, Europe must prepare for many restless, dangerous years. But it cannot be remedied by a few missionaries. The church must do more than send preachers and teachers among people who continue every day to suffer flagrant injustice. Justice must roll down as water and right as a mighty stream.

In the first place, through the League of Nations, Christendom must compel the Greeks to stop driving the Bulgarians out of Greek Macedonia; it must put an immediate end to Greek brutality, violence and murder.

Secondly, it must create tolerable conditions for the Bulgarians in Serbian Macedonia. The Bulgarians there have no schools or churches or newspapers of their own. They cannot speak Bulgarian in the stores or on the streets. Our forefathers fled to America to escape infinitely less oppression than that which prevails in Serbian Macedonia among the Bulgarians. That must cease.

Thirdly, the thousands of destitute refugees in Bulgaria must be helped. It is for no fault of their own that they are subjected to such terrible suffering. They have been driven from their homes because of international complications in which they took no direct part, and now they must be saved by international help.

Christianity is being tested here in the Balkans. The Christian nations have made life a hell for thousands and hundreds of thousands of people here in the Balkans. If Christianity is more than dogmas, forms and proselytizing, it must set about *at once* to remedy this situation.

Sofia, Bulgaria. R. H. MARKHAM

Last Thoughts of Anatole France

Material gathered from the notebooks of Anatole France by M. Michel Corday, and published under the title "Dernières Pages Inédites d'Anatole France," give an interesting glimpse of the methods of perhaps the most engaging of contemporary writers. His mind during these latter years naturally dwelt upon such subjects as War, Old Age, the Existence of God, the Future, and he usually began to develop his ideas by means of a dialogue in which one of the interlocutors presented his personal views. His material was then ready for the final stage in which an abstraction is transformed into the living Bergeret or Abbé Coignard.

It may be hopeless to attempt to discover the secrets of the creative imagination, but a writer's style owes much to the ideas that possess him and stir his emotions. Anatole France was dominated by a resistless sympathy, saved from the danger of sentimentality by a keen sense of reality. His hope for a happier civilization did not blind him to the cruel limitations imposed by savage natural laws. The sight of cruelty filled him with disgust. He accepted the carnivorous world as a hopeless enigma, but he thought that for mankind at least there was a chance of escape from savagery through man's ability to modify his environment. If men can produce in abundance the materials necessary for the enjoyment of life, the problem of distribution ought not to be too much for them.

Socialism seemed to Anatole France to offer the machinery for accomplishing the desired equalization, and like William Morris, he spun golden threads for the embellishment of the Socialist tapestry. Oddly enough, he does not seem to have been arrested in his wide reading by the theories of the French economists of the eighteenth century, though his compassion and the breadth of his sympathies mark him as a spiritual descendant of Quesnay and Turjot, and show him more thoroughly than the elder Mirabeau to be *l'ami des hommes.* But the principle of equal freedom which the Physiocrats did so much to develop, was but dimly apprehended by Anatole France. Without questioning the vague and ill-defined terms of the Socialists, he expected the overthrow of "Capital" to be followed by the fusion of all classes into a homogeneous world democracy. Not that he wished to obliterate racial and national characteristics, but rather to allow them to play their several parts in a rich and varied civilization, rid at last of unnecessary antagonisms.

The economists believed that the goal could be reached by freeing the individual from the arbitrary interference of government, whereas the

Socialists would trust authority to regulate the lives and activities of the people in minutest detail. Without weighing these opposing theories, Anatole France welcomed the Marxian revolution, hoping that it would be possible, without resort to violence, to overcome the pride and avarice engendered by "Capitalism" and win acceptance for a Socialism that should be regarded as "the conscience of the world."

This revolution, he felt, was being furthered by the trend of events, as a mill-wheel is turned by the flow of the stream. He believed that "a new order, a new science, new economic necessities, will impose a state of peace upon mankind, as formerly the very conditions of existence condemned men to a state of war." We are responsive to our economic environment, conflict being the result of laws and customs which produce false relationships and cause friction.

"Industrial violence creates military violence . . . Mercantile rivalries arouse in people hatreds that can only be quenched in blood. . . . The capitalist State, like the feudal State, is a warring State. Under the present régime of capitalist production the cannon fixes tariffs, establishes custom houses, opens and closes markets. . . . Extermination is the fatal result of economic conditions that exist today in the civilized world."

These were prophetic words when they appeared in 1907, in *Sur la Pierre Blanche*.

In spite of his hatred of war, Anatole France was not an uncompromising pacifist. His skeptical habit of mind made him hesitate to adopt an extreme position, and as M. Corday points out, he not only had a profound attachment to the past, but belonged to a generation that shared Alfred de Vigny's idea of the army as a select company, a school of self-sacrifice, austerity, bravery and honor, crowned by the religious sanction. And even granting the wickedness of war, it has to be reckoned with until changed economic conditions usher in an era of peace. Anatole France tried to draw a distinction between the patriotic obedience of the soldier and the guilty activity of officials and statesmen who stirred up international quarrels, but the war came and showed how insecure a footing is provided by compromise. The most eloquent hater of war since Tolstoy, engulfed in this general madness, was heard glorifying the detestable business of killing, and making the absurd promise that victorious France, unsullied by any criminal action, would extend the hand of friendship to the vanquished foe.

M. Corday's sympathetic explanation of the contending forces that governed Anatole France at this time cannot erase his inconsistency. In writing *Les Dieux ont Soif* it was his purpose, he says, not to condemn the Revolution, but "to show that men are not perfect enough to exercise justice in the name of Virtue, and that they ought to be guided by indulgence and kindness." It is the error of good men to suppose that the world can be made better by the forcible elimination of the wicked. The repudiation of violence must be unconditional, if the dreams of the Utopian are to be realized.

Of Anatole France it can be said that his humiliating association with the war mongers did not last long. Their cynical perversion of truth and the brutal prolongation of the war soon produced in him a revulsion of feeling, and he tried to atone for his defection by throwing his weight once more upon the side of mercy. But whereas his celebration of the war spirit had been broadcast to all the world as war propaganda, no criticism of collective murder could pass the censors, and there was no possibility of engaging the western world in a great moral discussion such as stirred it in the days of the Dreyfus affair. No contradiction of the war lies was permitted, and when the slaughter of youth was at its height the French Cabinet was made to look impressive and respectable by filling it with "the most illustrious old men of the Republic," the ages of six of these august officials, when added together, reaching a total of 449 years.

Having recovered his moral poise, Anatole France did what little he could to check the propaganda. In an ironical letter to a friend who had scoffed at the idea of peace without victory, he wrote:

"I must applaud the good taste that makes you prefer a symmetrical peace, one that is perfectly proportioned, plump, portly, full of honor and profit, in fact a victorious peace. It is true that we may have to wait a long time for this desirable peace. But we need not be in a hurry. France is losing by the war not above ten thousand men a day."

When it finally ended with the Peace of Versailles he did not hesitate to describe that iniquity as hypocritical and unstable, pregnant with future wars, new miseries and ruins. In Sweden, whither he went to receive the Nobel prize, he said:

"The most horrible of wars has been followed by a treaty which is not a treaty of peace but a continuation of the war. Europe will perish from it if reason is not finally admitted to its councils."

Again he cried:

"Let us seek peace with all our hearts. Desire it, for desire is the creative force, the only creative force in the universe."

And, addressing a group of educators in Tours, in 1919, he said:

"The teacher ought to incline the child to peace and its works; teach it to detest war; banish from its instruction everything that stimulates hatred of foreigners, even hatred of the late enemy. Not that we should be indulgent to crime and absolve the guilty, but because every people is composed of victims rather than criminals."

He declared that "Victory does not atone for the crime of war," and added, in his last public utterance, "We shall not be forgiven if we do not make peace."

We are told by M. Corday that in May, 1924, shortly before his death, Anatole France ordered a collection of all that he had written on the subject of war to be got ready for publication. He proposed to suppress that part which was inconsistent with his purpose to dishonor war. Among the sentiments to be discarded, says M. Corday, were those written at the beginning of the war "in horror and indignation, but in ignorance." His contribution to the war hysteria he characterized in a letter to a friend as "the worst act of my life."

This confession is the most important item in the material that M. Corday has selected from the mass of notes left by the great humanist. The unfinished fragments now published have the familiar ring. There is no poisoned dart on the ironic shafts. The pearls for which he dived into the manuscript of the master M. Corday has strung on a thread of graceful commentary that recognizes in the extremely human figure of his subject a nature enriched and ennobled by the range and depth of its sympathetic understanding.

FRANK W. GARRISON

Gandhi

From an Indian Viewpoint

Mohandas Karamchanda Gandhi is not an accident, nor is he merely an expression of Indian culture and its deeply-rooted spiritual basis. His whole life is one long assertion of that universal divinity which is inborn in every man.

He is not a politician, though in less than seven years' time he has done more to arouse the political consciousness of his people than the preceding 160 years of British tutelage had done. He is scarcely a religious man, as that term is commonly understood; though the influence of his life in getting that understanding broadened is already being felt by most living faiths. He is just a man—with humility for himself, reverence for the oppressed, kindness for the proud oppressor, and love for all forms and conditions of life.

There are millions in India who revere him and call him Mahatma (great soul); there are hundreds of thousands over the rest of the world who glibly call him a patriot or a saint; but there are very few who see what he steadily sees. In fact, most even of his "followers" and "admirers" see him in the light of their own preconceived notions and prejudices.

Nothing has impressed me more overwhelmingly during the past four years than the extraordinary divergent interpretations that I have heard given of the very simple life which Mr. Gandhi lives and the equally elementary truths which he teaches.

In the political arena in India, within my own experience, I have seen his name brandished by virtually every school of thought, from the Red Revolutionists to the Blood and Iron Imperialists. Each in turn has interpreted him and his "teachings" so that they accurately fit into its own well-worn groove of thoughts and prejudices. They have all, when it has suited them, proclaimed him as the very ideal of their respective creeds. One and all, however, have very soon found out that they could not contain him; and not being willing to expand their ideas, they have chosen the less difficult course, have thrown him overboard, and have thanked their gods for the providential intervention which saved them from choosing Mr. Gandhi as the head of their organization.

It is in the religious world, however, that Mr. Gandhi has played the most notable part, not only in India but in the rest of the world. Hinduism no longer feels itself a spent religion; it no longer boasts merely of having produced a Buddha or a Shankaracharya in the past; it proudly points out that it can still produce a Gandhi. In the realization of its new glory and consequent strength, it is rapidly throwing off the dead weight of the wrongs, such as untouchability, which with the lapse of time had crept into its heart, and under the shame of which it had hung its head these many evil days. Buddhism sees the Life being lived over again, with such vividness that the memory of the days of the great Tathagata (the perfect one) on earth becomes as fresh as though it all happened only the other day. Mohammedanism sees with joy and pride the remarkable results its contact with other faiths is producing, as much today as it ever did in its glorious past. Christianity sees the promised fulfillment now so much more potent of its own silent penetration into other faiths. Zoroastrianism, Sikhism, Jainism and other faiths have all found in Mr. Gandhi's life not only fresh strength and a further stimulus but, what is more than these, renewed faith in themselves.

And yet, while Hindus today are proud of Hinduism because Mr. Gandhi calls himself a Hindu; while Buddhists are discussing which of the five disciples of Buddha is reincarnated in Mr. Gandhi; while Christians are freely demonstrating the similarity between Mr. Gandhi's life and the life of the poor, humble and lowly Nazarene, even down to minor details; while Mohammedans are seeing in Mr. Gandhi's ardent fight against wrongs the strenuous life of a true Believer; while the Sikhs see in Mr. Gandhi the reproduction of the life of one of their own Gurus; while the Zoroastrians likewise see the radiating light of his life; none of these faiths—not even the very lax, lenient and tolerant Hinduism—feels any too great certainty about the future continuance of its unchallenged sway, even within its own limited sphere.

In a remarkable way, in the minds even of the orthodox members of each faith, Mr. Ghandi is identified with their own idealism and precepts; and yet by their organized churches he is looked upon with fear and apprehension.

And who is this Mr. Gandhi? and what is this simple life of his which, while inspiring each, fits in with none at all? As to his life, there are his own words that, had it not been for a certain sense of modesty, he would have shouted from his housetop that what he was doing was for no single people but for all mankind—a fact which it has taken more than ten years for his people in India to grasp. Now, however, they no longer think of him as the expression of his people's revolt against century-old social, political and religious wrongs; they regard him as the spokesman of the outraged and downtrodden of all the world.

But what is it that Mr. Gandhi is doing? He says that he is experimenting with that truth, the existence of which in the realm of nature was discovered, he says, long ago. He claims no credit for the originality of his experiments. In simple words he asserts that there exists in nature the reservoir of a force which is powerful for good. He expresses this force by a word of his own coining—Satyagraha, or Truth Force. At times he expresses it by the phrase Love Force, and at others by Soul Force.

That the reservoir of this force has from time to time actually been tapped by some individuals is, he says, recorded in history. That he himself has successfully and repeatedly tapped the reservoir and used this force, he himself, with the greatest humility, declares. That this force has been collectively used by groups of people from time to time, and that when so used it has proved to be just as effectual as when used by single individuals, is another claim which he quotes history to substantiate. To put all doubt at rest, he says that he has seen the collective application of this force being

successfully and easily carried out on several occasions through his own instrumentality; and he cites the Satyagraha struggles in South Africa, at Ahmedabad, at Champaran, at Kaira, and elsewhere.

His claim is that this force, like electricity, can with ordinary human effort be generated, carried through space, and used as a simple form of energy. God being Truth, Truth Force can, he says, only be used for God's purposes, that is for purposes which are based on truth, justice or righteousness.

The acquisition of control over this energy is, he says, the supreme glory of man. And while it is the most potent instrument which can be pitted against a conscious or even unconscious wrong, when used to inflict an injury or perpetrate a wrong it automatically nullifies itself and becomes utterly inefficacious. These, he says, are the reasons why he is so exceedingly eager that mankind should win the knowledge of how to create and use this power. Its efficacy and the rapidity with which it secures its purpose make him, he says, confident that general and even popular use is bound to be made of it sooner or later; his efforts are merely directed to hastening the day if possible. He says, however, that it is far from being a weapon of the weak or the cowardly, as has often been mistakenly supposed; on the contrary, it is the weapon of the really strong and truly brave, for in the act of generating this energy great moral strength and even heroism are put to the test. He declares, in fact, that almost invariably its application takes the form of heroic suffering—but suffering that is cheerfully self-imposed, without even a thought of bitterness or resentment against the wrongdoer—suffering which begins even before this energy is set in motion. He claims, however, that the use of this energy is cheaper in the long run, the saving being perceived at the time of reconstruction after the struggle is over; for the use of this energy, after transforming wrong into right, leaves no legacy of ill-will or hatred, and therefore causes no wastage; the gain that it brings is all gain.

He has no illusion as to final perfectibility. He is fully aware that there will always be right and wrong in the world (though their forms and degrees may vary from age to age), and therefore a constant need for struggle. He has repeatedly said that he does not think that the human mind can ever devise a system, social, political or religious, which will continue to be good and just for all time. All systems, he says, sooner or later cease to be good or even just, and then must grow into or be replaced by other systems. But, he says, whereas in the past we have generally effected radical changes purely through brute force, in future we may always resort to the application of the Truth Force, the highest and most economical type of natural force. It is this great, this colossal advance towards the realization of which he has already contributed in no small degree.

The greatness of Mr. Gandhi's simple life is essentially its humility. The other day a number of leaders of the spiritual life and thought in India said that the purity of Mr. Gandhi's life stimulates all forms of life, good and evil alike, which come into contact with it; that his life is like a brilliant light illuminating the objectives of all kinds of people, who thus, looking through their own colored glasses, see them with an increased vividness but still according to their own lights. Mr. Gandhi's reply to this was perhaps the only reply which he has made to a personal reference to him. He said that the forces for good and evil in nature stand clearly apart, mixing no more than milk and oil in the same vessel. An addition of milk in the vessel will increase the total volume of the contents, but will only add to the quantity of the milk and not of the oil; so, also, a truly good and pure life, while increasing the quantity of energy at the disposal of mankind, will never give strength to aught but that which is pure and good in itself. He added that whenever people have used his name or drawn upon his words or an act in his life to do a wrong, he has closely searched his own heart, and has invariably found lurking in some hiding place traces of wrong, traces perhaps of pride or some other vice, which he knew must have been responsible for that wrong use of his words or his act. He insists that when he has purified his life sufficiently it will strengthen and support the good and good-doers only, never evil and evil-doers.

As to his life of abnegation, he says that, having had the freedom to choose, he has chosen in sheer joy. His ultimate hope is that one day want and suffering will be destroyed, and it is for the hastening of the arrival of that day that he has chosen the life which people have graciously ascribed as the life of poverty. He has chosen that mode of life in order to shed pride and learn humility, and thus to qualify himself to lead others in the fight against want, suffering and wrong. He has chosen, he says, deliberately to make a fire of his own life, so that others who are near him may be temporarily warm in the unnatural warmth of that burning fire, until they are able to be warm in the warmth of the wisdom of their own selves.

In this stupendous assertion of his, one is merely reminded of what the Buddhists call "Our Lord's last sacrifice." When, it is recorded, angels opened the portal of Heaven to Gautama and told Him that, having attained perfection on earth, He was now free to choose what He willed, whither He would go, and what He would do, and that they were bidden to obey His commands; Buddha, in His supreme love of the younger brethren who were still coming on behind him along the King's Highway, choose of His own free will to stand at the entrance of that portal until all life on earth had also attained perfection and had passed through the Gate. Only then would he enter Heaven.

Reconciliation. *Tarini P. Sinha.*

MOMENTS

Moments come to us that are so beautiful
We would not have them follow
In the retinue of our Memory
Garish and bitter things,
We would cloister them apart
As the first quiet stars of evening.

Picture them with the gold-fingered gleaming
Of sunrise on hushed flowers,
Dream of them to grave and distant music,
And take refuge with their beauty
At the white altar of the inner soul.

LUCIA TRENT.

The Study Table

A Book for Boys

Not long ago, we noticed "Trust a Boy," by Walter H. Nichols. It was the story of a quartette of Salt Lake City boys of days gone by. It was a fine story of real boys and we believed, and still do, that there was an element of biography in the tale —that the *young* Nichols had known these boys, or similar boys, and told things that really happened—at least in general outline. For that reason, we believed that the author had written himself out in "Trust a Boy," had exhausted his material, had run dry. We doubted the wisdom of his trying again. However, he has tried again, and the result is before us in "The Measure of a Boy."* It is again the four boys of the earlier book: the scene is again the Great Salt Lake; the story is again one of a boat and boating. The boys are older, of course, though not much time passes between the stories. The boat is a finer, much more pretentious craft. The mental quickness of our young heroes seems a trifle slackened. The plot is more complicated, deeper, does not work out so clearly. But it is a good story, with a larger element of the improbable. It is well told and will interest not only the young people for whom it is primarily intended, but some of us older people as well. In language and literary style it is far above the "Oliver Optic" and Horatio Alger of our boyhood, though any "old" reader of it will necessarily recall "Oliver Optic" as he reads. Oliver Optic never got away from a boat and a lake in his stories; he would have failed, had he done so. In one respect Mr. Nichols shows remarkable skill. His four boys, chums and associates, are remarkably individual—and their individuality is sharply maintained throughout in both stories. We feel that there is probably a third story ahead. Mr. Nichols will never surpass "Trust a Boy." He maintains a high level in "The Measure of a Boy." We now believe that, if he ventures a third story, it will be no discredit to its predecessors.

FREDERICK STARR

* "The Measure of a Boy." Walter H. Nichols. New York: 1925. The Macmillan Co. 16°, pp. xiii, 270.

Van Loon on Tolerance

Mr. Van Loon's new book,* "Tolerance," may be regarded as a special chapter of his already famous "Story of Mankind." Beginning with earliest times, he carries down to "the last hundred years" the tale of man's awful struggle for the right to speak his mind as ever against the power of church and state. The author began his task with great enthusiasm, and his earliest chapters are decidedly his best. Midway in his narrative (page 195), he confesses to a "feeling of boredom." This appears at just the point where the book, as a history, begins to go to pieces. From this point on, Mr. Van Loon abandons all attempt at serious narrative and largely contents himself with giving a series of sketches of certain great men more or less identified with the battle for free thought and free speech. Erasmus, Rabelais, Servetus, the Socini, Montaigne, Arminius, Bruno, Spinoza, Frederick the Great, Voltaire, Diderot, Lessing, Tom Paine, are the names most prominently mentioned. The concluding chapter is a mere excuse for a study of the last century which contains enough material in itself for a second volume. By this time, evidently, the author was utterly bored, and thus glad enough to wind up his task and get done with it for good and all.

Mr. Van Loon is delightful, as always, in his treatment of history, but at a heavier cost in this book of profundity and accuracy than in any of his previous books. Much of this volume is mere journalism of a hurried and superficial type. He is seen at his best, perhaps, in his opening "Prologue," and in his closing pages of summary. Mr. Van Loon is undoubtedly a genius, and also a competent scholar. But it is just as well not to be careless and superficial even in a purely popular work.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

* "Tolerance," by Hendrick Van Loon. Published by Boni and Liveright, New York. $5.

Correspondence

THE WASHINGTON CONFERENCE

Editor of UNITY:

I am interested in all that I see of your writing, and generally in agreement. I would like to enter a protest against the idea of considering the Washington Conference as a failure and a fraud. Of course, so far as Europe is concerned it did not amount to much, but it had the very greatest value in dealing with the Japanese government, but unfortunately thrown out of power by the fool action of our Congress. As a matter of fact, at our Pan Pacific Union Conference on Education, in 1921, at which I presided, the whole matter was discussed quietly between the Americans and the excellent Japanese representatives, and the Japanese Commission at Washington followed implicitly the lines of our discussion and agreement.

I was in Japan through the summer of 1922, and I saw every one of these agreements literally carried out. The armies withdrawn from China, Shantung turned back to the Chinese, large dismissals made from the staff of the Army and Navy, the Navy itself agreeing with this but the Army fighting with its back against the wall. We are slowly getting back the ground which we obtained at that time.

The foreign minister of Japan, Count Uchida, said to me personally "I resigned office some time since as a protest against our Siberian policy, and now the whole miserable mess is up for me to settle."

Very truly yours,

DAVID STARR JORDAN,

Leland Stanford, California.

AMBASSADOR PAGE AND PRESIDENT WILSON

Editor of UNITY:

The remarkable series of articles by Professor Harry Elmer Barnes in the *Christian Century* on the reasons why the various nations entered the World War reaches perhaps its highest interest for most of us in the seventh article of the series, just published, on "Why America Entered the War." Professor Barnes here writes with great severity of the attitude of Ambassador Page at London in the period when President Wilson and our State Department were greatly disturbed over what they felt to be the English violations of international law which vitally affected both Germany and neutral nations. He charges that Mr. Page in that early period of the war "persistently and openly fought against Mr. Bryan and Mr. Lansing in the effort of the latter to protect American rights," and he emphasizes

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

Conference on Our Relations with Latin America

The Chicago League of Women Voters Forum announces a Conference on Our Relations with Latin America, Saturday, February 13, in the Congress Hotel.

Samuel Guy Inman, who is Secretary of the Committee on International Cooperation in Latin America (A clearing house for 30 Foreign Mission Boards doing work in Latin America) will offer suggestions for a constructive foreign policy.

Mr. Inman lived ten years in Mexico, where he was in charge of a Mission School. He spent ten additional years in travel in other Latin American countries.

Three hundred thousand young people in mission study classes in the Protestant churches of North America are studying Latin America this year. Many will wish to hear the man who through his books and lectures has done so much to further inter-American friendship.

Professor Jessie S. Reeves, head of the department of Political Science of the University of Michigan, will speak on the proposed Conference of Jurists to be held at Rio de Janeiro. Our government has appointed Mr. Reeves a delegate to this conference which has the problem of codification of international law before it.

Our policy with reference to the Latin-American Republics has been severely criticised. The dissatisfaction in these countries with this policy is undeniable. Are the Latin-Americans turning to the League of Nations as an escape from the Monroe Doctrine? What is the political significance of American investments in these countries? These and other problems will be discussed and constructive suggestions made for their solution by leading experts.

The sessions will be held at 11:00 a. m. and 2:00 p. m., in the Florentine Room of the Congress Hotel. General admission 50c, covering both sessions.

Churches Much Encouraged by Progress Toward World Peace During Past Year

The year now closing has seen a greater advance toward permanent world peace than any other year since the outbreak of the war, says a statement issued today by the Trustees of the Church Peace Union. The statement says that this conclusion is based upon the annual report made by Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, General Secretary of the Church Peace Union, who during the year visited almost every country in Europe, and also the countries of Asia and Africa bordering on the Mediterranean. Two years ago Dr. Atkinson, after a similar survey, declared that the world was on the brink of another great war if events continued the course they had followed since the end of the war. During 1924 he observed a slight change for the better in the international situation, and now, he believes, the tide has definitely turned. In his report Dr. Atkinson says, in part:

"When the armies of the various nations engaged in the war were demobilized the nations themselves failed to or were unable to demobilize the battalions of hate that had been released. Every honest effort made to arrive at an understanding between the nations had to stand such an overwhelming assault of the hatreds engendered by the war, men and women everywhere became cynical. The only thing that was certain in many minds was that no good could be achieved. Conference methods came in for criticism. San Remo, Brussels, Genoa, London, Cannes, all marked successive and disastrous defeats.

"Gradually, however, the tide began to turn. The hatreds began to be dispelled. A new economic foundation was being built over the ruined edifice of European civilization. The World Court commanded increasing confidence. The League of Nations, through its Council and Assembly, has become the recognized agency toward which all the nations naturally look for guidance in international affairs and to which they are entrusting more and more authority. Through its labor office and various commissions it is humanizing and bettering living conditions throughout the world. Then came Locarno with its new spirit and its results which mark a definite turn for the better in international affairs. There is still much to be done. The nations are loaded with debts. Newfound friends are still a bit suspicious. The cynic is made secure in his position by the easy assumption of the confirmed optimist who sees in Locarno the end of all strife, and on the other hand by the perfectionist who, with microscopic care, has already been able to discover many flaws in what might have been, to his way of thinking, a perfect consummation. The fact is that Locarno simply marks a milestone on the road and the distance ahead is not very clearly indicated. All we know is that we will have to trudge on many weary miles patiently enduring disappointments and disillusionments, but the great thing is to keep in mind that the world is now in the right road and faced in the right direction."

Speaking of the future plans of the Church Peace Union Dr. Atkinson says: "There are certain outstanding principles upon which we are operating that we must not lose sight of. The program of the Church Peace Union is a practical program. It must

---

in this connection the startling statement of Lord Grey, in his recent reminiscences, which most readers of that work have passed over rather carelessly. Lord Grey says:

"Page came to see me at the foreign office one day and produced a long despatch from Washington contesting our claim to act as we were doing in stopping contraband going to neutral ports. 'I am instructed,' he said 'to read this despatch to you.' He read and I listened. He then said: 'I have now read the despatch, but I do not agree with it; let us consider how it shall be answered.'"

This was certainly an amazing diplomatic procedure; and I speak as a sincere friend and admirer of Mr. Page on the literary side. The official representative of our government presents to the foreign minister of the English government a serious protest against a course which deeply concerned and offended us, and assures the minister that he does not agree with his own government and suggests their cooperation in framing a rejoinder!

Of course President Wilson knew nothing of this incident. But he knew enough of other things in the same line to warrant his declaration that "Page was more British than the British" and to explain his coolness to Mr. Page on the latter's visit to Washington soon afterwards. The President had proclaimed that the United States must be strictly neutral, that the assumption that Germany was the one guilty nation was absurd, and that the war had sprung from a multitude of complex causes. He was trying to act with an impartial hand. Of course the Versailles treaty in 1919 was based on the theory of the one guilty nation. But Mr. Asquith, Mr. Lloyd George and Lord Grey, the three responsible English statesmen, have all now publicly abandoned that position. President Wilson did not hold it in 1914 and 1915; but Mr. Page did hold it and acted accordingly in his dealings with the English foreign office, in contravention of his instructions from Washington.

Professor Barnes's contention is that this was more responsible than anything else for provoking Germany to her submarine warfare, which ultimately drew us into the war. Her government knew well what was going on in London and that we were not carrying an even hand; and her existence depended upon England's observance of international law as concerned neutrals. Our own Admiral Sims justified, from the naval point of view, the torpedoing of the Lusitania, loaded so largely, as the Germans knew, and as we now know, with munitions of war; the seamanship on the Lusitania which the submarine had the right to expect should have prevented loss of life. This opens large issues. But such articles as this by Professor Barnes must be seriously considered by our people. He is no more "pro-German" than Professor Fay, his colleague at Smith College, whose articles on the causes of the war, in the *American Historical Review* and elsewhere, are so impartial and so illuminating. Both of them are simply pro-truth.

EDWIN D. MEAD.

Boston, Mass.

be advanced enough to keep in front of the groups we propose to lead, but not so far in advance that those whom we are trying to lead will not be able to see us or to find us. In the new interest in international affairs and the feverish efforts being made by some who have not been long nor closely affiliated with the movement, there is an effort to commit the churches to what must appeal to a large number of people as an impossible position. However, whatever may be the merits of the discussion as to the ethics of the use of force and the amount of force that is admissible under given circumstances, this is beside the mark in the task to which we have set ourselves and for which the Church Peace Union exists. Therefore, in the program outlined and the work undertaken we assume much of that which might be interesting to discussion as a theoretical question and base our program upon the clearer understanding that war and the war theory is inhuman, un-Christian, opposed to every religious instinct and is a dismal and ghastly failure as a means of settling international disputes, and that the only way by which it can be eradicated is by the creation of a new spirit, by promoting friendship, by eliminating hatreds and animosities and working for those agencies, courts and leagues which gradually will bring the world to think of itself as one community, a community with a soul and a conscience that will make war as impossible as would be the holding of slaves in a free republic."

Church Peace Union.

CHILDREN OF REVOLUTION

Story of John Reed Children's Colony on the Volga, which is as well a story of the whole great structure of Russia.

By ANNA LOUISE STRONG

Dr. Scudder, Wellesley, says "Delightful book"; Dr. Thorp, Palo Alto, "I certainly take off my hat to her as a writer"; Ruth Lind, Puyallup, "Mamma told me to tell you that she hasn't time to eat her supper because she has to read that book to us."

This book, 100 pages, printed Dec. 1925 (3000 copies) has gone, Jan. 15, to a second printing. Price, 50 cents. Send to Strong—508 Garfield St.—Seattle.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS
3913 Cottage Grove
Tel. Atlantic 1876

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Monroe 6940 732 W. Van Buren Street, CHICAGO

For Happy Health!

Drink a glassful of Bowman's Milk. You'll like it, for Bowman's Milk is full cream milk. It is always rich and pure. In it are the elements so necessary for happy health!
Make it a habit to drink a glass of Bowman's Milk at every meal.
Insist on
BOWMAN DAIRY COMPANY MILK

DREXEL State Bank
Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Subscribe for and read UNITY

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office: 608 S. Dearborn St.
CHICAGO

FEBRUARY

Attentions to your wardrobe and home should include the cleansing and sanitation of garments and furnishings now showing the effects of Winter's soot and grime. Only by our new continuous flow process are the finest results obtained.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers
PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue